Atty. Docket: 1320-62 (NL 000279)

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed on November 1, 2005. Claims 1-13 are pending in the application with Claims 1, 7 and 13 being in independent form.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-13

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,541 issued to Kamen et al. on May 8, 2001 ("Kamen et al.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,452,416 issued to Hilton et al. on September 19, 1995 ("Hilton et al."); Claims 3-5, 9-11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamen et al. and Hilton et al. as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,084,598 issued to Chekerylla on July 4, 2000 ("Chekerylla"); Claims 2 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamen et al. and Hilton et al. as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,301,512 issued to Motzer on October 9, 2001 ("Motzer"); and Claims 6 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamen et al. and Hilton et al. as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,203 issued to Goldberg et al. on October 5, 1999 ("Goldberg et al."). The rejection with respect to at least independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's believe that the subject matter of independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 as currently presented patentably distinguish over the disclosure of Kamen et al., Hilton et al. and Chekerylla, taken alone or in any proper combination.

Atty. Docket: 1320-62 (NL 000279)

Claim 1 recites:

A method for providing and processing a cursored user interaction with a spatially displayed medical image and performing image processing on said medical image, wherein said method comprises the steps of:

providing a menu-less graphical interface having a plurality of sensitive areas, each sensitive area is positioned at a predetermined, fixed relative position with respect to an associated medical image display field and with respect to at least one additional sensitive area, wherein each of the plurality of sensitive areas corresponds to at least one function and is associated with one of a plurality of different cursors providing a visual cue as to the at least one function corresponding to each of the plurality of sensitive areas; and controlling a mouse configured such that positionings of said mouse within each of said plurality of sensitive areas causes display of one of the plurality of different cursors and allows activation and control of a plurality of processing functionalities for performing the at least one function respectively associated with each of said plurality of sensitive areas." (Emphasis added).

Claims 7 and 13 recite the same limitations as the limitations of Claim 1.

Support for the underlined claim limitations can be found within Applicant's written description at page 4, lines 20-21 and throughout the various figures.

Kamen et al. is directed to the use of templates on a screen. Each template is associated with a process or link which can be invoked by moving a cursor to the area on the screen represented by the particular template which corresponds to the process or link which is desired to be invoked. In a particular embodiment, when the cursor is moved to one of the regions corresponding to a template, the cursor changes appearance. As such, according to Kamen et al. "a user can determine whether cursor 8 is located in an active region by observing the appearance of cursor 8."

Kamen et al. does not disclose or suggest that the appearance of the cursor provides additional information to the user, such as a visual cue as to at least one function

Atty. Docket: 1320-62 (NL 000279)

12/12/2005 14:57 PAGE 09/11 6315013259

> Application No.: 09/864,128 Reply to Office Action Dated: November 1, 2005

corresponding to a particular template. Hilton et al. and Chekerylla do not cure the deficiencies of Kamen et al.

In particular, Hilton et al. with respect to independent Claims 1 and 7, and the combination of Hilton et al. and Chekerylla with respect to independent Claim 13 do not disclose or suggest the features not disclosed or suggested by Kamen et al. That is, none of the cited references taken alone or in any proper combination disclose or suggest "wherein each of the plurality of sensitive areas corresponds to at least one function and is associated with one of a plurality of different cursors providing a visual cue as to the at least one function corresponding to each of the plurality of sensitive areas; and controlling a mouse configured such that positionings of said mouse within each of said plurality of sensitive areas causes display of one of the plurality of different cursors," as recited by Applicant's independent Claims 1, 7 and 13.

With respect to independent Claims 1 and 7, Hilton et al. discloses at column 15, line 35 to column 16, line 68, that a user can change the shape of a cursor by positioning the cursor over an image manipulation icon in the control panel and clicking the left button of the mouse. The shape of the cursor is then changed to the shape of the selected icon and results in illumination of the icon at the control panel.

In contrast, Applicant's invention, as recited by independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 provides that by positioning the mouse within an area causes display of a cursor corresponding to that area (single task), and not by positioning and clicking (two tasks) the mouse as required by Hilton et al.

Atty. Docket: 1320-62 (NL 000279)

Chekerylla does not cure the deficiencies of Hilton et al. with respect to independent Claim 13. Chekerylla discloses a computer system for modifying digital images of the human form as well as other objects. Chekerylla does not disclose or suggest Applicant's recitations as recited by independent Claim 13. That is, Chekerylla does not disclose or suggest "wherein each of the plurality of sensitive areas corresponds to at least one function and is associated with one of a plurality of different cursors providing a visual cue as to the at least one function corresponding to each of the plurality of sensitive areas; and controlling a mouse configured such that positionings of said mouse within each of said plurality of sensitive areas causes display of one of the plurality of different cursors," as recited by Applicant's independent Claim 13.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 recite limitations which are patentably distinct over the disclosures of the cited references. Hence, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to Claims 1, 7 and 13 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 and 8-12 depend from Claims 1 and 7, respectively, and therefore include the limitations of Claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, for the same reasons given for Claims 1 and 7, Claims 2-6 and 8-12 are believed to contain patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to Claims 2-6 and 8-12 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Atty. Docket: 1320-62 (NL 000279)

U. Conclusions

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-13, are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call John Vodopia, Esq., Intellectual Property Counsel, at 914-333-9627.

Respectfully submitted.

George Likourezos Reg. No. 40,067

Attorney for Applicant

Mailing Address: Intellectual Property Counsel Philips Electronics North America Corp. P.O. Box 3001 345 Scarborough Road Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001